

REMARKS

Claims 1-58 are pending and stand rejected. None of the claims has been amended.

The Examiner noted in paragraph 2 that he was unable to locate the Information Disclosure Statement that have submission dates of February 12, 2001, February 26, 2001, March 13, 2003, and July 29, 2003. In order to expedite prosecution of this application, Applicants have enclosed duplicate copies of these Information Disclosure Statements and all non-U.S. patent references. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner indicate consideration of the documents submitted with these Information Disclosure Statements by initialing the PTO-1449 form submitted therewith and attaching same to the next communication to Applicants.

Claims 1, 3-8, 13-16, 18, 21, 23-28, 33-36, 38, 41, 43-48, 53-56, and 58 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Win. Applicants respectfully traverse. Claim 1 recites:

A method for virtualizing super-user privileges in a computer operating system including multiple virtual processes, the method comprising:

- designating a plurality of virtual super-users, each virtual super-user being associated with a separate virtual process;
- intercepting a system call for which actual super-user privileges are required; and
- in response to the intercepted system call being made by a virtual super-user and pertaining to the virtual process of the virtual super-user:
 - granting actual super-user privileges to the virtual super-user; and
 - allowing execution of the system call.

The claimed invention enables resource ownership in the context of multiple virtual private servers. Specifically, it relates to a method for granting a user of a virtual process (such as a virtual private server) super-user privileges without compromising system security. A virtual super-user is associated with a virtual process. When a system call requires actual super-user privileges, the call is intercepted. If the call was made by a virtual super-user and it pertained to

the virtual process of the virtual super-user, then the virtual super user is granted actual super user privileges. This prevents, for example, a user associated with one virtual process from exercising super-user privileges with respect to another virtual process.

Win does not disclose, suggest, or teach “designating a plurality of virtual super-users, each virtual super-user being associated with a separate virtual process.” Win discusses using administrative roles to govern access to administrative functions. For example, Win discusses associating a user with one or more administrative roles, which are associated with one or more administrative functions such as “find, view a user record” and “reset user’s password” (abstract; Table 1). Win does not, however, disclose associating a user with a process, let alone associating a virtual super-user with a process. In fact, Win does not disclose associating anything with a process, whether it be a user, a super-user, an administrative role, an administrative privilege, or an administrative function. Nor does Win disclose associating anything with a virtual process. Therefore, Win does not disclose, suggest, or teach the claimed element “designating a plurality of virtual super-users, each virtual super-user being associated with a separate virtual process.”

Claims 2, 22, and 42 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Win in view of Hutchison. Applicants respectfully traverse. These claims depend from their respective base claims, which were shown above to be patentable over Win. In addition, these claims recite other features not included in their respective base claims. Thus, claims 2, 22, and 42 are patentable over Win in view of Hutchison for at least the reasons discussed above. Additionally, for the record, Applicants traverse the Examiner’s assertions concerning the disclosure of Hutchison and the motivation to combine Win and Hutchison.

Claims 9-12, 17, 19, 20, 29-32, 37, 39, 40, 49-52, and 57 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Win in view of O’Brien. Applicants respectfully traverse.

These claims depend from their respective base claims, which were shown above to be patentable over Win. In addition, these claims recite other features not included in their respective base claims. Thus, claims 9-12, 17, 19, 20, 29-32, 37, 39, 40, 49-52, and 57 are patentable over Win in view of O'Brien for at least the reasons discussed above. Additionally, for the record, Applicants traverse the Examiner's assertions concerning the disclosure of O'Brien and the motivation to combine Win and O'Brien.

Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims are allowable over the cited art of record and request that the Examiner allow this case. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned in order to advance the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

XUN WILSON HUANG, et al.

Dated: 8-24-04

By: Sabra-Anne R. Truesdale

Sabra-Anne R. Truesdale

Reg. No. 55,687

Fenwick & West LLP

Silicon Valley Center

801 California Street

Mountain View, CA 94041

Tel.: (650) 335-7187

Fax.: (650) 938-5200